arXiv:1009.6012v1 [hep-ph] 29 Sep 2010

One loop predictions for the pion VFF in Resonance Chiral Theory

J.J. Sanz-Cillero

Grup de Física Teòrica and IFAE, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,
E-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain

Abstract. A calculation for the one-loop pion vector form-factor in Resonance Chiral Theory is provided in this talk. The amplitude is computed up to next-to-leading order in $1/N_C$ and, by means of high-energy constraints, we are able to produce a prediction for the corresponding $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ Chiral Perturbation Theory low energy constant $L_9(\mu_0) = (7.6 \pm 0.6) \cdot 10^{-3}$ at the scale $\mu_0 = 770$ MeV.

Keywords: Chiral Lagrangians, $1/N_C$ expansion
PACS: 11.15.Pg, 12.39.Fe,

Introduction

The issue of developing a quantum field theory for the interaction of the hadronic degrees of freedom is still an open one. More exactly, in this talk we focus our attention on the description of the chiral Goldstones [1] and the mesonic resonances. We will work within a chiral invariant framework for resonances, namely, Resonance Chiral Theory [2, 3]. The large–N_C limit and the $1/N_C$ expansion will be taken as guide lines to sort out the quantum field theory computation, implementing a perturbative counting with the appropriate suppression of the hadronic loops [4].

A pretty interesting observable to study is the pion vector form-factor $\mathscr{F}(q^2)$ (VFF):

$$\langle \pi^+\pi^- | \frac{1}{2}\bar{u}\gamma^\mu u - \frac{1}{2}\bar{d}\gamma^\mu d | 0 \rangle \quad = \quad (p_{\pi^+} - p_{\pi^-})^\mu \, \mathscr{F}(q^2) \, . \tag{1}$$

This amplitude is very well measured experimentally, being a precise and basic test for any proposed hadronic description. In order to provide reliable predictions for more complicated observables [5, 6, 7] one needs to be able to describe well controlled QCD matrix elements as this, the VFF [8, 9], which is known to be well dominated by the first vector meson, the $\rho(770)$ [10, 11].

We will work within the single resonance approximation, including only the chiral Goldstones and the first resonance multiplets of vector (1^{--}), axial-vector (1^{++}), scalar (0^{++}) and pseudo-scalar resonances (0^{-+}) [2, 3, 12]. Likewise, only operators of at most $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ are considered, i.e., with at most two derivatives [2]. Operators with a higher number of derivatives tend to violate the high-energy behaviour prescribed by QCD [13, 14]. Likewise, the study of some particular amplitudes have shown how these higher derivative terms of the Lagrangian can be reduced into operators with a lower number of derivatives and operators with only Goldstones by means of convenient meson field redefinitions [8, 15].

Nothing restricts the number of meson fields in the operators of the RχT Lagrangian but for the organization of the one-loop computation it is convenient to classify them by their number of resonance fields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}_{R\chi T} &= \mathscr{L}_G + \sum_R \mathscr{L}_R + \sum_{R,R'} \mathscr{L}_{RR'} + \dots \, , \\
\mathscr{L}_G &= \frac{F^2}{4} \langle u^\mu u_\mu + \chi_+ \rangle \, , \\
\mathscr{L}_R &= \frac{F_V}{2\sqrt{2}} \langle V_{\mu\nu} f_+^{\mu\nu} \rangle + \frac{i\, G_V}{2\sqrt{2}} \langle V_{\mu\nu} [u^\mu, u^\nu] \rangle + \frac{F_A}{2\sqrt{2}} \langle A_{\mu\nu} f_-^{\mu\nu} \rangle + i\, d_m \langle P \chi_- \rangle \\
&\quad + c_d \langle S u_\mu u^\mu \rangle + c_m \langle S \chi_+ \rangle \, ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

provided in Ref. [2], together with their corresponding kinetic terms $\mathscr{L}[R]^{Kin}$. In addition, one has several other operators with two resonance fields that may enter in the VFF at next-to-leading order in $1/N_C$ (NLO) [7, 8]. Nonetheless, only the diagrams with a cut of two Goldstones or a Goldstone and a resonance will be taken into account, being the absorptive channels with two resonances kinematically suppressed [7]. The relevant vertices that may then contribute to the VFF at one loop are [6, 7, 9]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{L}_{SA} &= \lambda_1^{SA} \langle \{ \nabla_\mu S, A^{\mu\nu} \} u_\nu \rangle \, , \quad \mathscr{L}_{PV} = i \lambda_1^{PV} \langle [\nabla^\mu P, V_{\mu\nu}] u^\nu \rangle \, , \\
\mathscr{L}_{SP} &= \lambda_1^{SP} \langle u_\alpha \{ \nabla^\alpha S, P \} \rangle \, , \quad \mathscr{L}_{VA} = i\lambda_2^{VA} \langle [V^{\mu\nu}, A_{\nu\alpha}] h^\alpha_\mu \rangle + i\lambda_3^{VA} \langle [\nabla^\mu V_{\mu\nu}, A^{\nu\alpha}] u_\alpha \rangle \\
&\quad + i\lambda_4^{VA} \langle [\nabla_\alpha V_{\mu\nu}, A^{\alpha\nu}] u^\mu \rangle + i\lambda_5^{VA} \langle [\nabla_\alpha V_{\mu\nu}, A^{\mu\nu}] u^\alpha \rangle \, .
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The brackets $\langle \dots \rangle$ denote trace in flavour space and the chiral tensors u^μ, $\chi_\pm$, $f_\pm^{\mu\nu}$ (containing Goldstones and external sources) are defined in Refs. [2, 6]. In this talk we refer to the diagrammatical quantum field theory calculation of the VFF at NLO although its derivation through dispersion relations is completely equivalent and can be found in Ref. [9]. Further details on the $\mathscr{O}(p^6)$ LEC predictions and alternative numerical estimates can be found there. The chiral limit is assumed all along the talk.

High-energy conditions

The full VFF is well known to vanish when $q^2 \to \infty$ [16]. Thus, RχT can be then used as an interpolator between both regimes, showing at leading order (LO) the simple structure [3, 12]

$$\mathscr{F}(q^2) = 1 + \frac{F_V G_V}{F^2} \frac{q^2}{M_V^2 - q^2} \quad \overset{F_V G_V = F^2}{=} \quad \frac{M_V^2}{M_V^2 - q^2} \, , \tag{4}$$

where the requirement that the VFF vanishes at $q^2 \to \infty$ leads to the LO relation $F_V G_V = F^2$ [3] and the usual monopolar form for the VFF. This expression can be also understood from a Padé–approximant point of view as a $[0/1]$ Padé–type approximant with the pole fixed to M_ρ^2 [17], being the first of a series of Padé sequences.

At NLO in $1/N_C$, the corresponding one-loop diagrams are ultraviolet (UV) divergent [5, 8, 18, 19] and, in addition to the renormalization of some couplings of the LO

Lagrangian, one needs to introduce some subleading operators [8, 19],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}_{\rm NLO}^{\rm G} &= -i\widetilde{L}_9 \langle\, f_+^{\mu\nu} u_\mu u_\nu \,\rangle\,, \\ \mathscr{L}_{\rm NLO}^{V} &= X_Z \langle V_{\lambda\nu} \nabla^\lambda \nabla_\rho \nabla^2 V^{\rho\nu} \rangle + X_F \langle V_{\mu\nu} \nabla^2 f_+^{\mu\nu} \rangle + 2\, i X_G \langle V_{\mu\nu} \nabla^2 [u^\mu, u^\nu] \rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

However, the $\mathscr{L}_{\rm NLO}^{V}$ couplings $X_{Z,F,G}$ are not physical by themselves: it is not possible to fix them univocally from the experimental VFF. Indeed, as these subleading $\mathscr{L}_{\rm NLO}^{V}$ operators are proportional to the equations of motion, one finds that $\mathscr{L}_{\rm NLO}^{V}$ can be fully transformed into the M_V, F_V, G_V and $\widetilde{L}_9$ terms and into other operators that do not contribute to the VFF by means of meson field redefinitions [8, 19]. Thus, the on-shell VFF does not really need all the terms in Eq. (5) to make the amplitude finite, just $\widetilde{L}_9^{\rm eff}$, $F_V^{\rm eff} G_V^{\rm eff}$ and $M_V^{\rm eff\,2}$ [8, 19]. In what follows, we will always refer to the simplified Lagrangian and the “eff” superscript of the LO parameters will be implicitly assumed.

As we did before at large–N_C, we can now take the one-loop VFF and use it as an interpolator between high and low energies, by imposing again short-distance constraints on $\mathscr{F}(q^2)$. In a similar way, its spectral function ${\rm Im}\mathscr{F}(q^2)$ must go to zero at high energies. In the present work [9], we will actually impose this constraint channel by channel, i.e., we will demand that each separate two-meson cut ${\rm Im}\mathscr{F}(q^2)|_{M_1,M_2}$ vanishes at $q^2 \to \infty$. Actually, for spin–0 mesons this must be so as its one-loop contribution to the spectral function is essentially the VFF at LO (which vanishes at infinite momentum) times the partial-wave scattering amplitude at LO (which is upper bounded). For the higher spin resonances the derivation is more cumbersome as the Lorentz structure allows for the proliferation of form-factors and the unitarity relations are not that simple. Still, in many situations it has been already found that these amplitudes with massive spin–1 mesons as final states must go to zero at high energies even faster due to the presence of extra powers of momenta in the unitarity relations coming from intermediate longitudinal polarizations [7].

The high-energy expansion of our one-loop RχT expression yields the structure

$${\rm Im}\mathscr{F}(q^2) \;=\; q^2 \left(\beta_2^{(p)} + \beta_2^{(\ell)} \ln \frac{-q^2}{M^2} \right) + \left(\beta_0^{(p)} + \beta_0^{(\ell)} \ln \frac{-q^2}{M^2} \right) + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{1}{q^2} \right), \tag{6}$$

which requires the constraints $\beta_2^{(p)} = \beta_2^{(\ell)} = \beta_0^{(p)} = \beta_0^{(\ell)} = 0$. The $\ln(-q^2/M^2)$ terms are produced by the triangle diagrams with crossed exchanges of resonances of mass M. The short-distance conditions derived from every channel are:

- $\pi\pi$ channel: $$F_V G_V = F^2\,, \qquad 3\,G_V^2 + 2\,c_d^2 = F^2\,, \tag{7}$$

  where the first one coincides with the large–N_C constraint for the VFF. The second one is consistent with that obtained in the context of the $\pi\pi$–scattering at LO [20].
- $P\pi$ channel: $$\lambda_1^{\rm PV} = 0\,, \tag{8}$$

  consistent with the large–N_C constraint from the vector form-factor into $P\pi$, studied in Ref. [7]. This kills completely the $P\pi$ loop contribution to the $\pi\pi$ VFF.

- $A\pi$ channel: The constraints have several solutions but we have kept just those consistent with the large–N_C vector form-factor into $A\pi$, studied in Ref. [7].

$$\begin{aligned} -2\lambda_2^{\mathrm{VA}}+\lambda_3^{\mathrm{VA}} &= 0\,, \\ -\lambda_3^{\mathrm{VA}}+\lambda_4^{\mathrm{VA}}+2\lambda_5^{\mathrm{VA}} &= \frac{F_A}{F_V}\,, \\ -\frac{F_A\,G_V\left(M_A^2-4M_V^2\right)}{3\sqrt{2}M_A^2 c_d\,F_V} &= \lambda_1^{\mathrm{SA}}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

After imposing the right high-energy behaviour on the spectral function the logarithmic and polylog terms of the VFF also vanish at $q^2\to\infty$ and only the purely rational part has the wrong behaviour. The one-loop contribution has a unique decomposition in the form [7, 9]

$$\mathscr{F}(q^2)^{1-\ell oop} \;=\; \overline{\mathscr{F}}(q^2)^{1-\ell oop}+\frac{2q^2}{F^2}\hat{\delta}_2+\hat{\delta}_0\frac{q^2}{M_V^2-q^2}+\hat{\delta}_{-2}\frac{q^2}{(M_V^2-q^2)^2}\,, \tag{10}$$

where the subtracted function $\overline{\mathscr{F}}(q^2)^{1-\ell oop}$ can be obtained through a once-subtracted dispersion relation and it is fully determined by the two–meson spectral function $\mathrm{Im}\mathscr{F}(q^2)$ [7, 9]. It behaves like $\mathscr{O}(q^0)$ at high energies and has no contribution to the real part of the single and double poles at $q^2=M_V^2$, which are fully given by $\hat{\delta}_0$ and $\hat{\delta}_{-2}$. The UV divergences are contained in the real constants $\hat{\delta}_k$. Actually, we will consider the on-shell vector mass scheme δM_V^2 such that the real part $\hat{\delta}_{-2}$ of the double pole is completely removed. The form-factor has then the structure [8, 9]

$$\mathscr{F}(q^2) \;=\; 1+\left(\frac{F_V G_V}{F^2}+\hat{\delta}_0\right)\frac{q^2}{M_V^2-q^2}+\frac{2q^2}{F^2}\left(\widetilde{L}_9+\hat{\delta}_2\right)+\overline{\mathscr{F}}(q^2)^{1-\ell oop}\,, \tag{11}$$

where the subtracted loop contribution behaves at high energies like $\overline{\mathscr{F}}(q^2)^{1-\ell oop}=\delta_0+\mathscr{O}(1/q^2)$ and leads to the VFF expansion,

$$\mathscr{F}(q^2) \;=\; \frac{2q^2}{F^2}\left(\widetilde{L}_9+\hat{\delta}_2\right)+\left(1+\delta_0-\frac{F_V G_V}{F^2}-\hat{\delta}_0\right)+\mathscr{O}\left(\frac{1}{q^2}\right)\,. \tag{12}$$

After demanding now that the VFF vanishes as $q^2\to\infty$, one gets the NLO constraints

$$\widetilde{L}_9+\hat{\delta}_2=0\,, \qquad\qquad \frac{F_V G_V}{F^2}+\hat{\delta}_0=1+\delta_0\,. \tag{13}$$

The subleading corrections $\hat{\delta}_2$ and $\hat{\delta}_0$ will always appear in combination with $\widetilde{L}_9$ and $F_V G_V/F^2$, respectively, which absorb their UV divergence. The expressions from Eq. (13) can be compared to their large–N_C values $\widetilde{L}_9=0$ and $F_V G_V/F^2=1$. Thus, the μ–independent constant δ_0 is the actual relevant quantity here, which will ultimately participate in the LEC determination. In Table 1 one can find the contributions

TABLE 1. Correction δ_0 to the renormalized combination of couplings $F_V G_V/F^2$ from the different two–meson channels. The low-energy contribution ξ_{L_9} from the one-loop part $\overline{\mathscr{F}}(q^2)^{1-\ell oop}$ is also provided.

	$\pi\pi$	$A\pi$	$P\pi$
δ_0	0.23	0.14	0
$\frac{F^2}{2M_V^2}\delta_0$	$1.5\cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.0\cdot 10^{-3}$	0
ξ_{L_9}	$-1.6\cdot 10^{-3}$	$-0.1\cdot 10^{-3}$	0

from the various channels. We also provide its final contribution to the chiral LEC, $L_9(\mu)=...+\frac{F^2}{2M_V^2}\delta_0$, as we will see in the next section. After considering the relations (7), (8), (9) and (13) the spectral functions can be expressed in terms of G_V, F_A, F and masses.

Low-energy expansion and predictions

The low-energy expansion of the one-loop part produces the massless χPT log together with a series of analytical terms: $\overline{\mathscr{F}}(q^2)^{1-\ell oop}=\frac{2q^2}{F^2}\xi_{L_9}+\frac{q^2}{F^2}\frac{\Gamma_9}{16\pi^2}\left(\frac{5}{3}-\ln\frac{-q^2}{\mu^2}\right)+\mathscr{O}(q^4)$, where part of the $\pi\pi$ loop contribution has been explicitly separated of ξ_{L_9} for convenience for the matching with χPT. The RχT coefficient that appears in front of the chiral log is exactly $\Gamma_9=1/4$ [1], ensuring the recovery of the proper renormalization scale dependence of the LEC. Thus, independently of the value of the RχT parameters the chiral symmetry invariance allows one always to match the low-energy χPT expression [21, 22],

$$\mathscr{F}(q^2) \;=\; 1+\frac{2L_9(\mu)q^2}{F^2}+\frac{\Gamma_9}{32\pi^2}\left(\frac{5}{3}-\ln\frac{-q^2}{\mu^2}\right)+\mathscr{O}(q^4)\,. \tag{14}$$

Substituting the short-distance constraints from the previous section, one gets the simple form for the LEC prediction,

$$L_9(\mu)=\frac{F^2}{2M_V^2}\left(1+\delta_0\right)\;+\;\xi_{L_9}(\mu)\,. \tag{15}$$

For illustrative reasons we provide in Table 1 the numerical contributions from the different two–meson channels to ξ_{L_9}.

At large N_C, one has the LO estimate $L_9=\frac{F_V G_V}{2M_V^2}=\frac{F^2}{2M_V^2}\simeq 6.8\cdot 10^{-3}$ [3]. This determination however lacks of the one-loop χPT running, so it carries an uncertainty on the saturation scale which can be naively estimated as $\Delta L_9\simeq 0.5\cdot 10^{-3}$ by varying μ^2 between $M_\rho^2/2$ and $2M_\rho^2$ [2, 20]. We will compare this to the LEC prediction at NLO in $1/N_C$ with the inputs $M_V=770\pm 5$ MeV, $M_S=1090\pm 110$ MeV, $F=89\pm 2$ MeV, with G_V varied between its limit upper value $F/\sqrt{3}$ and 40 MeV, $M_A=1200\pm 200$ MeV and $F_A=120\pm 20$ MeV. If we add the one-loop diagrams with $\pi\pi$ absorptive cut, one obtains $L_9(\mu_0)=(6.6\pm 0.4)\cdot 10^{-3}$ for the standard comparison scale $\mu_0=770$ MeV.

TABLE 2. Comparison of our $L_9(\mu_0)$ determination at $\mu_0 = 770$ MeV with previous analyses.

	$\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ χPT [1]	**$\mathcal{O}(p^6)$ χPT [22]**	**$\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ τ–SR [23]**	**$\mathcal{O}(p^6)$ τ–SR [23]**	**τ–RχT [11]**	**This work [9]**
$10^3 L_9(\mu_0)$	6.9 ± 0.7	5.93 ± 0.43	6.54 ± 0.15	5.50 ± 0.40	7.04 ± 0.23	7.6 ± 0.6

Finally, if the $A\pi$ channel is also added (the $P\pi$ one is exactly zero after the high-energy constraints), we get the final prediction provided in Table 2, where it is compared to previous determinations [1, 11, 22, 23].

Acknowledgements

Talk given at QCD@Work 2010 –International Workshop on QCD: Theory and Experiment–, 20-23 June 2010, Martina Franca, Valle d'Itria (Italy). I would like to thank the organizers for their attentions during the conference. This work was supported in part by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovacíon under grant CICYTFEDER-FPA2008-01430, the Juan de la Cierva Program, the EU Contract No. MRTN-CT-2006-035482 –"FLAVIAnet"–, the Spanish Consolider-Ingenio 2010 Programme CPAN (CSD2007-00042) and the Generalitat de Catalunya under grant SGR2009-00894.

REFERENCES

1. S. Weinberg, Physica A **96** (1979) 327; J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Annals Phys. **158** (1984) 142; Nucl. Phys. B **250** (1985) 465.
2. G. Ecker *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **321** (1989) 311.
3. G. Ecker *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **223** (1989) 425.
4. G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **72** (1974) 461; **75** (1974) 461; E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **160** (1979) 57.
5. O. Catà and S. Peris, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 056014 [arXiv:hep-ph/0107062]; I. Rosell *et al.*, JHEP **0701** (2007) 039 [arXiv:hep-ph/0610290]; J.J. Sanz-Cillero and J. Trnka, Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 056005 [arXiv:0912.0495 [hep-ph]]; J.J. Sanz-Cillero, [arXiv:1009.3446 [hep-ph]].
6. V. Cirigliano *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **753** (2006) 139 [arXiv:hep-ph/0603205].
7. A. Pich *et al.*, JHEP **0807** (2008) 014 [arXiv:0803.1567 [hep-ph]];
8. I. Rosell *et al.*, JHEP **0408** (2004) 042 [arXiv:hep-ph/0407240].
9. I. Rosell, [arXiv:1009.1969 [hep-ph]]; A. Pich, I. Rosell and J.J. Sanz-Cillero, forthcoming.
10. G.J. Gounaris and J.J. Sakurai, Phys. Rev. Let. **21** (1968) 244.
11. J. J. Sanz-Cillero and A. Pich, Eur. Phys. J. C **27** (2003) 587 [arXiv:hep-ph/0208199].
12. M. Knecht and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. B **424** (1998) 335-342 [arXiv:hep-ph/9712457]; S. Peris *et al.*, JHEP **9805** (1998) 011 [arXiv:hep-ph/9805442].
13. A. Pich, PoS CONFINEMENT **8** (2008) 026 [arXiv:0812.2631 [hep-ph]]; [arXiv:hep-ph/0205030].
14. I. Rosell *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 076009 [arXiv:0903.2440 [hep-ph]]; J. Portolés *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 114011 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611375].
15. L.Y. Xiao and J.J. Sanz-Cillero, Phys. Lett. B **659** (2008) 452-456 [arXiv:0705.3899 [hep-ph]].
16. G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Lett. B **87** (1979) 359; Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980) 2157; Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 1808.
17. P. Masjuan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D bf 78 (2008) 074028 [arXiv:0807.4893 [hep-ph]]; P. Masjuan and S. Peris, JHEP **0705** (2007) 040 [arXiv:0704.1247 [hep-ph]].
18. I. Rosell *et al.*, JHEP **0512** (2005) 020 [arXiv:hep-ph/0510041].
19. J.J. Sanz-Cillero, Phys. Lett. B **681** (2009) 100-104 [arXiv:0905.3676 [hep-ph]].
20. Z. H. Guo *et al.*, JHEP **0706** (2007) 030 [arXiv:hep-ph/0701232].
21. J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. B **250** (1985) 517.
22. J. Bijnens and P. Talavera, JHEP **0203** (2002) 046 [arXiv:hep-ph/0203049].
23. M. Gonzalez-Alonso *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 116012 [arXiv:0810.0760 [hep-ph]].